

AL SMITH *the* LIBERAL

Thinking Republicans and Democrats Alike Are Voting for Him

REPUBLICAN

MR. ERNEST S. BALLARD, Lawyer, Interstate Commerce Specialist President Winnetka Board of Education, gives point of view of Independent Republican.

To the Winnetka Smith-for-President Club:

I have been asked to state my reasons for voting for Smith.

As the opposition party is ordinarily charged with being solely destructive, I shall state an affirmative reason first. I believe that Smith is better qualified by training and temperament to discharge successfully the duties of the presidency than Hoover. The soundness of this view depends upon three factors—the requirements of the presidency, the qualifications of Smith, and the qualifications of Hoover. The presidency is not a business position, as is sometimes supposed, but a political one. It stands at the center of the system of checks and balances which characterizes the American form of government. It is the President's duty to report to Congress from time to time on the state of the nation and to recommend legislation. It is the duty of Congress to pass such legislation as it thinks proper. It is the duty of the President to sign or to veto such legislation as is passed. It is the duty of Congress (if it wishes) to reconsider vetoed legislation and (if it can) pass it over the veto. The same interrelation exists in the matter of executive appointments. The President names the new incumbent, subject to the advice and consent of the Senate, and the Senate confirms or not as it chooses. Without Senate confirmation the appointment fails. Team work between the President and Congress is therefore essential or we are in a stalemate. To bring about such team work the President must have the support of public opinion and must interpret public opinion to Congress and Congress to public opinion. That is a brief description of the most important part of the President's work.

Now, what manner of men are brought forward to fill this unique and difficult place? On the one hand we have Smith—the veteran politician of our largest state, whose statesmanlike accomplishments Republican and Democrat alike commend without reservation. Short of the presidency he has made the finest record in the field of government of any American living or dead.

On the other hand we have Hoover—the greatest mining engineer in the world, head of the Belgian Relief before our entry into the war, United States food administrator under Wilson, head of the post war European relief agencies, and finally Secretary of Commerce and creator of the reorganized and expanded department. All of these important and exacting positions he filled with brilliant success.

I have no wish to belittle Hoover's accomplishments—he is one of our great Americans—but after everything claimed for him is admitted fully and generously, the fact remains that he has never held an elective office or been charged with the direction of the great and elusive forces of politics. And taking Smith's record only at the valuation put upon it (before the present campaign) by the leaders of Republican thought, Hughes and Root, the fact remains that he has demonstrated his preeminent fitness to hold the highest elective office in the nation and to guide its political destinies.

There is an equally great contrast in the temperament of the two men and it points to the same conclusion. Hoover is a strong, silent man, given to decisions based upon technical considerations. He has the point of view of a scientist. He is impatient of the vagaries of the popular will and could not readily take the people into his confidence. In this campaign he has not done so at all. Smith, on the other hand, has the rare gift of being able to give voice to the aspirations of the people. He makes articulate their desires and clothes them in the common tongue. This was the strength of Lincoln, of Roosevelt and of Wilson. I am convinced therefore that if the question is to be determined on the score of fitness for the work to be done Smith is the man.

My position as to the other issues may be briefly stated.

In the matter of prohibition I believe we squarely face the choice of nullification or modification. I prefer modification.

In international affairs most of the progress since the war has been made by liberal governments. Our hope of progress lies in that direction.

As for prosperity, the sound variety is not a Republican monopoly. What we have of it is due to economic not political causes, and will continue under either party.

The parties no longer differ in principle on the tariff and I think in practice the Democrats can best be trusted to protect both the American producer from foreign competition and the American consumer from protection.

The matter of party responsibility alone should be controlling. The Republican record of the past seven and a half years has been characterized by repeated scandals, the major one of which has been officially stamped within a year by the Supreme Court as a breach of public trust. Moreover it was brought to light by a Democrat working against the most determined opposition which the Republican party could offer.

Finally, I believe that a fundamental and permanent political realignment is taking place. The industrial development which commenced after the civil war and the financial concentration which started at the beginning of this century have worked wonders with our material prosperity. But the development and protection of human rights has lagged far behind. The result is a serious dislocation between the technical and the human side. They are a hundred years apart. If we are to avoid the disturbances—perhaps catastrophes—which this misalignment promises, we must let property take care of itself for a while and pay attention to people. Either because they share or repudiate this diagnosis, huge numbers of voters are jumping the fence. The parties in their old conceptions are gone—the party that saved the Union and the party of states' rights. In their places are rising a party of conservatism and a party of liberalism. My sympathies are with the latter.

ERNEST S. BALLARD.

DEMOCRATIC

MR. ROSWELL B. MASON, Master in Chancery, explains why intelligent Democrats are proud to back their candidate.

To the Winnetka Smith-for-President Club:

The principal reasons for electing Governor Smith President of the United States seem to me to be the following:

These ideas are, of course, not original, but I believe that they are so persuasive, and indeed, so compelling, that they cannot be given publicity too often.

His long service as Governor of the State of New York abundantly qualifies him for the highest office in the Country. Two of the greatest Presidents of modern times, Grover Cleveland and Theodore Roosevelt, were graduated, so to speak, from the Governorship of the State of New York to the Presidency of the United States. When they took the oath of office at Washington, they were trained men; experts in the science of being chief executive. Governor Smith also is an expert in this science. He has succeeded in persuading or compelling the politically hostile Legislature of the State of New York to pass much beneficial and needed legislation. This Legislature—for three-fourths of his eight years as Governor, Republican in both branches, and for the other one-fourth, Republican in one branch—has never overridden a single veto of Governor Smith's and no appointment made by him has ever been disapproved.

He can and will persuade or compel Congress to pass good laws. He has demonstrated that he knows how to do it. Through his leadership of Congress he will lead the whole country.

Why should the people of the United States reject a man with Governor Smith's experience and knowledge, in favor of Mr. Hoover, who has had no experience of this sort, and, so far as any one knows, no such knowledge? Mr. Hoover's experience as Food Administrator, and as a member of two Cabinets, isn't at all like the experience of the Governor of a great State. The people with whom Mr. Hoover has worked were, to a great extent, his own employes—fundamentally different from an independent legislative body over which the law gives him no control. How do we know that he knows how to handle such a body? How do we know what he can do with Congress?

Republican speakers and writers seem to me to steer clear of these arguments. They do not discuss them; they do not answer them.

To be sure, Congressman Morton D. Hull, in an article in *The Chicago Daily News* for October 24, 1928, in which he compares the two Candidates and decides in favor of Hoover, grudgingly admits that: "Governor Smith is said to have been a good Governor of the State of New York. This may be so . . ." But Congressman Hull calmly ignores the proven fine quality and power of Smith's leadership of legislative bodies. This omission from consideration of well established facts seems to me to destroy the entire effect of Mr. Hull's conclusion.

Among the splendid measures that Governor Smith has been instrumental in having enacted into law in New York are the following: The reorganization of the state government; the protection of women and children and working people; the advancement of education; the improvement of the living conditions of the wards of the state; the preservation of the State's public properties; the extension of the civil service laws, and the health and social welfare laws. Isn't it fair to assume that, as President, he will advocate and obtain the passage by Congress of legislation of equally high character?

The views and policies of the two leading candidates for President, as expressed in their public addresses, are now well known. I think that Governor Smith has shown that he stands for reform, and that Mr. Hoover has shown that he favors conservatism. For example: Governor Smith advocates certain changes in the prohibition law and the Eighteenth Amendment which, if adopted, will remedy the present wide spread condition of law breaking and disrespect for law, and he favors government ownership and control of natural water power resources. Mr. Hoover doesn't want to change the prohibition law and the Eighteenth Amendment, and he is opposed to the principle of government ownership and control of natural water power resources.

This country needs a leader, not a follower:

Is Mr. Hoover a leader, when he offers us no relief from the present system of boozing prohibition? In this connection, permit me to quote from former President Hadley of Yale University. Mr. Hadley says:

"What first decided me to vote for Governor Smith was his courageous stand on the prohibition question. The object of the eighteenth amendment was to stop drunkenness and promote public order. This object has not been attained. The amendment and its enforcing statute, the Volstead act, have not only failed to secure either of these results, but have failed so conspicuously as to produce disrespect for law among private citizens and public officials alike."

"For at least five years it has been the paramount duty of the party in power to recognize this situation and deal with it intelligently. This obligation it has failed to meet."

Is Mr. Hoover a leader, as Theodore Roosevelt was, in the people's fight for the ownership and control of their natural water power resources? This question answers itself, if one compares Roosevelt's positive with Hoover's negative utterances on the subject.

Is Mr. Hoover a leader, when, ten days before election, driven by popular dissatisfaction, he says that, if elected, he will call, under certain circumstances, a special session of Congress to deal with farm relief? If he believes this desirable, why didn't he declare for it before? Why didn't he give the country this assurance, of his own motion, instead of hesitating and finally yielding at the last minute to insistent pressure?

So much for the reasons that appeal to me as controlling. How about the election? Will Smith be elected? I confidently believe that he will be. I base this belief mainly on two grounds:

1. Senator La Follette has utterly repudiated Mr. Hoover and has unqualifiedly praised Governor Smith. The party or body of voters of which Senator La Follette may fairly be said to be the outstanding leader, cast over 4,800,000 votes in 1924. The bulk of this vote will doubtless go to Governor Smith, which means that he will carry not Wisconsin alone, but four or five other western states.

2. Governor Smith's clear, courageous and forceful speeches and his delightful personality have captured the mind and soul of the country. The enthusiasm for him is growing every hour and has become irresistible. He goes from triumph to triumph. The wonderful reception given him in Chicago was surpassed in Boston. Boston, in turn, has been surpassed by that stronghold of Republicanism, Philadelphia, and now Baltimore has gone far beyond Philadelphia.

As Franklin Roosevelt well said of him:

"He has the will to win—he not only deserves success but commands it. Victory is his habit."

The duty of the Smith supporters in Winnetka is plain. We must not be dismayed by desperate Republican propaganda given out to bolster up a lost cause. We must cast our votes, and see that others who think as we do cast their votes, on November 6, for the most progressive and the greatest statesman of the time—Alfred E. Smith.

ROSWELL B. MASON.

Four Times Democratic Governor of a Normally Republican State

VOTE for AL SMITH *the* WINNER